150.5 — Abnaki

GUACANAGARI PONTIAC BLACK HAWK
MONTEZUMA CAPTAIN PIPE KEOKUK
GUATIMOTZIN LOGAN SACAGAWEA
POWHATAN CORNPLANTER BENITO JUAREZ
POCAHONTAS JOSEPH BRANT MANGUS
SAMOSET RED JACKET COLORADAS
MASSASOIT LITTLE TURTLE LITTLE CROW
KING PHILIP TECUMSEH SITTING BULL
UNCAS OSCEOLA CHIEF JOSEPH
TEDYUSKUNG SEQUOYA GERONIMO
SHABONEE

TO PERPETUATE THE HISTORY AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE PEOPLE REPRESENTED BY THE ABOVE CHIEFS AND WISE MEN THIS COLLECTION HAS BEEN GATHERED BY THEIR FRIEND

EDWARD EVERETT AYER

AND PRESENTED BY HIM TO THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY 1911

150.5
Amaki

421
R173
Or
1883
R

GRAMMATICAL SKETCH OF THE ANCIENT ABNAKI

OUTLINED IN THE DICTIONARY OF FR. SEBASTIAN RÂLE, S. J.

PART I. — THE ABNAKI NOUN.

BY REV. MICHAEL CHARLES O'BRIEN.

READ AT THE MEETING OF THE MAINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY, AT PORTLAND, DECEMBER 23, 1882.

A GRAMMATICAL SKETCH

OF THE

ABNAKI NOUN,

AS OUTLINED IN THE DICTIONARY OF THE
REV. SEBASTIAN RÂLE, S. J.

BY

REV. MICHAEL CHARLES O'BRIEN,
OF BANGOR.

REPRINTED FROM VOLUME IX. COLLECTIONS OF
MAINE HISTORICAL SOCIETY.

PORTLAND.
1887.

THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY
CHICAGO

GRAMMATICAL SKETCH OF THE ANCIENT ABNAKI.

THE paper which I have the honor of reading before you contains the partial results of a study undertaken with the view of tracing the grammatical structure of the ancient Abnaki, the aboriginal language of our State.

It embraces only so much of the general subject as is necessary for treating of the Abnaki noun. But even this portion of the study will occupy so much time that I shall be obliged to omit the historical and literary information which is usually introduced into a paper of this kind.

The treatment of this study which alone I consider satisfactory is of a nature so purely grammatical and philological that I should doubt about its adaptation to the objects of an historical society, if the subject did not touch so closely upon an interesting portion of the history of the State, and, in some of its phases, had not already engaged the attention of the Maine Historical Society, and occupied so considerable a space in its publications.

My principal sources or materials for the study

are the "Dictionary of the Abnaki," written by Father Sebastian Râle, S. J., and the old Indian prayers and catechism, yet in use (in a modified form) among the Penobscots and Passamaquoddies, which very probably are the work of the same author.

The field has been already traversed by other students, but so little has been gleaned from it that it may be said to be yet almost untouched.

The dictionary was in the hands of Duponceau and Pickering and others of less note, but it has hitherto remained a sealed book so far as the grammatical outline of the aboriginal language of Maine, which may be read in its pages, is concerned. The little catechism, which the Indians call from its first question, the *Aweni Kisi hoskesa* (Who made thee?), and the old formulas of prayer have been published by Fathers Demilier and Vetromile, and are extant in manuscript in the handwriting of the former. These serve chiefly as illustrations, and supplement in several particulars some of the deficiencies of the dictionary, which is my main authority.

This dictionary consists of about 7,500 distinct Abnaki words, with the meanings of nearly all of them in French; but on every page it contains grammatical notes, examples, and Indian phrases. These phrases would fill a dozen or more pages of foolscap paper. The grammatical notes consist not merely of marks of singular and plural, indications of moods, tenses, and persons, but also several short grammatical observations in Latin.

Scattered as all these bits of information are up and down the pages, and applied to so many different words, they at first only bewilder the curious reader. But when the words to which they are severally appended are classified and compared, and the principles of grammatical induction are introduced to complete the process, they furnish at least an outline, more or less distinct, of the grammar of the language to which they refer. Of a certain portion of the grammar, that especially to which this paper will extend, the outline is very clear and full. Until such an outline shall be studied, the language of the Abnakis will continue to remain the puzzle it has been hitherto, notwithstanding all that has been written and published concerning it.[1]

Akin to this subject, if not forming properly a part of it, is the subject of the formation of words in Abnaki, and the meaning of their generic component parts; but however interesting this might be, especially as affording an opportunity of accounting for some of our geographical names of Indian origin, I shall confine myself for the present to questions of mere grammar.

[1] It would appear that some library in Canada possesses valuable materials in manuscript for the study of the Abnaki. L'Abbé Maurault, in his *Histoire des Abenaquis* (pp. 501–5), mentions a *Vocabulaire Abnakis* of P. Aubery, a *Dictionnaire de Racines Abnakises*, of 900 pages, left by P. Lesueur, besides treatises, sermons, and instructions by the same author. This much is mentioned as having been yet extant in 1866, a great deal more having been lost in a fire which destroyed the chapel of the Abnakis at St. Francis in 1759.

At any rate, the solution of these questions is a necessary preliminary to the inquiry into the structure of the words.

A paper of this kind is ordinarily dry reading and tedious to listen to, especially at the hands of one who is unskilled in the art of imparting to it any accidental enhancement; but it is to be hoped that its novelty, if not its connection with the history of our State, will compensate for its want of direct interest.

The grammatical system of American languages is so different from those of the Indo-European and Shemitic families, that a new grammatical terminology has been found necessary to describe it. In this paper, however, I shall restrict myself almost entirely to terms which have been already employed by writers on the cognate languages, and which are familiar to students of this sort of lore.

The general subject naturally divides itself into the four usual parts of grammar, — orthography, etymology, syntax, and prosody. For even the accents and length or brevity of syllables have to be taken into account; and Catholic missionaries have tried to adapt the language to the measures of the Gregorian chant in use in the liturgy of the Church. However, we are chiefly concerned with the second part, etymology, or the parts of speech, and their respective inflections.

For much respecting the alphabet and orthography used by Father Râle I must content myself with referring my readers to the notes of the

learned editor of the dictionary, although I am of the opinion that they contain a few errors, and need to be supplemented in several important particulars.[1]

[1] The alphabet employed by Father Râle consists of the following letters : —

a, *b*, *d*, *e*, *g*, *h*, *i*, *j*, *k*, *m*, *n*, *o*, *p*, *r*, *s*, *t*, 8, *z*, and *n̈* (nasal), and the pause or aspirate, '.

Upon these letters I remark, —

1st. *J* occurs only in foreign words such as *Jesus ; g* is always hard except in one word, *angeri*, an angel.

2d. The Greek χ (*chi*) is equal to *kh*, and is interchanged with it, as in *a8ikhigan* and *a8iχigan*, a book.

3d. There is no *l ;* whereas in none of the modern representatives of the Abnaki is there an *r*, but *l* is used invariably where Râle employs *r ;* so that with this change Râle's dictionary is generally intelligible to a modern Penobscot. The names *Norombega* and *Orono* would seem to indicate that this change of liquids, so characteristic of Indian dialects, took place within a century.

4th. The vowels (including the 8, where it is a vowel) have the Italian sounds.

5th. This 8, which is nothing else than the Greek contract of the diphthong *ov*, pronounced *oo*, takes the place of our English *w* and the Italian *u*. It is *w* before a vowel, and *u* before a consonant and at the end of a word.

6th. The *n̈* with two dots over it, which I call the nasal *n*, is a sign that the syllable which it affects (either at the beginning or end) must receive a nasal utterance. It will consequently give rise to a sound varying according to the letter which follows.

Before a labial it will be almost an *m*, as in *Arenaïbe*, an Indian (or Abnaki). In other situations it will resemble the nasal *n* in French, as in *sängemaï*, a chief, out of which the English made "sagamore."

It appears to have been employed in many cases by Father Râle to express the nasal sound that is produced by giving a distinct utterance to the vowel *a* before 8, as in *aï8di*, a path. On the whole, it cannot be regarded as a letter so much as a diacritical mark.

7th. The letters *ts*, *tz* generally stand for *tch* or *ch*, sharp in English (as in *match* and *church*), for which the French have no corre-

I now pass to my main subject, which is the etymology of the (ancient) Abnaki noun.

sponding sound. This I infer not only from the pronunciation by the modern Penobscots and St. Francis Indians of the words in which these letters occur in the dictionary, but from the geographical names found in the dictionary, either in full or in their roots. The only examples which occur to me at present are : —

Matsibig8ad8ssek, Matchibigaduce (Castine).

Messats8ssek, Massachusetts.

Narañts8ak, Norridgewalk.

Tsebigek, Chebeague.

The first three of these names occur in the dictionary in full, and the last in its root. If we can infer that the English pronunciation of these words approximated to the original Indian, it follows that the letters *ts* and sometimes *tz* in the dictionary are to be pronounced like *tch* or *ch* in English. There are, however, a few words, and only a very few, in the modern Penobscot, in which the sound of *ts* occurs, as *metsi*, late, and even this appears to be a contraction of *mētĕssi*.

8th. The Greek mark of aspiration, (ʻ), which so often occurs in the middle of words in the dictionary, judged by the modern pronunciation seems to indicate a pause in the utterance rather than an aspiration. This pause, always coming after a vowel, naturally gives rise to an aspiration, and in many cases to a guttural sound, which has been sometimes represented by *k* and *hk*. Writers in the Micmac indicate the corresponding sound in that language by a *k* out of perpendicular, as may be seen in Maillard's Grammar. Examples of this pronunciation in Abnaki are *ne mo'sañtsin*, I love (him), *ned ari'ra*, I go, *aro'sse*, he comes.

9th. There are only two diphthongs : *ai*, pronounced like the same in German, or *aye*, yes, in English, and *au*, pronounced like *ow* in how, cow. Examples : *ned Arenaïbai*, I am an Indian, an Abnaki; *nisankau*, the abstract number 12. *Aî*, with a circumflex, is pronounced as the same combination in the French, as in *faire*.

I have indulged in these remarks on the alphabet because they seemed necessary in part to correct errors and in part to supplement omissions in Mr. Pickering's notes to the dictionary.

Upon the whole, I regard the system of orthography used by Father Râle as one of the best I have seen employed by any writer on these languages.

With the exception of the occasional use of the *e* mute of the

THE PARTS OF SPEECH.

The parts of speech are: the noun, pronoun, verb (including concrete numbers), which are inflected; and the adjective, adverb, preposition, conjunction, and interjection, which are uninflected, or inflected only by some of the minor changes which, as we proceed, will become known by the name of accidents. Thus the language has all our parts of speech except the article. The absence of the indefinite article is common to many languages with it, and needs no explanation. The concrete numeral for one (*pesek8*) is often employed for it, as in Hebrew.

The want of the definite article is compensated for by particles, pronouns, and especially by a great variety of verbal and participial forms, which latter denote not only the number, as in Greek and Latin, but also the person of the nouns with which they agree.

THE NOUN.

The properties of the Abnaki noun can be conveniently described under the two general heads of *Classification* and *Inflection*.

I. *Classification.*

By the classification of nouns is meant the dis-

French, and the use of *ts* for *tch*, and the employment of nasal *n* where a diæresis would suffice, it is almost perfect. Such as it is his system is uniform and constant, and, with the exceptions above mentioned, could hardly be improved upon for the purpose of representing the sounds of the surviving dialects of the Abnaki.

tribution of all objects into two general classes, which Father Râle calls respectively "noble" and "ignoble" objects. This distribution takes the place of gender in most, if not all, of the languages of the American continent. This is true at least of all the languages of the Algonkin, or, as they are more appropriately called by Schoolcraft, the "Algic" family, to which the Abnaki belongs. Gender is a grammatical property entirely unknown to them. They have words to distinguish the sexes, but nothing corresponding to our *he*, *she*, and *it*, and their different cases, as such. This explains why Indians, when they attempt to speak English, make such sad havoc of our pronouns. A man will sometimes speak of a woman as "he," "his," and "him," whilst a woman will apply the feminine pronouns to a man. In their own language the pronouns, both personal and possessive, are the same for both sexes.[1]

The rules of classification are the following: —

1. To the *noble* class belong the names of all living objects and of trees. Hence nouns of this class are called by some writers nouns *animate*, and the corresponding verbs, verbs *animate*.

2. To the ignoble class belong the names of all inanimate objects. Hence these nouns may be called *inanimate*, and the corresponding verbs, *inanimate* verbs.

[1] It is not a little remarkable that this want of grammatical gender is characteristic of the Basque, the language, as Whitney says, "without affinity in Europe," of the Magyar or Hungarian, and the Turkish, both languages of Asiatic origin.

3. Quite a number of objects which are inanimate by nature are raised to the grammatical rank of noble objects, and their names treated grammatically like the names of living or naturally noble objects.

The only reason I can discover of this distinction is the esteem in which the objects were held, or the superstition with which they were regarded.

Usage is the only law which determines what inanimate objects are thus ennobled. In Râle's dictionary the following classes of words are noble : —

1. The names of the sun, moon, and stars, and of months, as *gis8s*, the sun, *gis8s nibasset*, the moon, *gis8s*, a month.

2. The ornaments and principal articles of dress in ancient use, as *8añbañbi*, bead work, wampum; *8rg8ana*, a bird's wing; *8rg8anigan*, feather of the wing; *a8ip8n*, feather of the bird's tail; *kañ8i*, the quill of the porcupine. Under this head come the names of the valuable fur skins, which were all noble, whilst the skin of the moose was ignoble.

3. Certain domestic utensils, and some of the materials for the construction of the wigwam and canoe.

Examples: *8rañde*, a dish made of bark; *sedi*, the branch of the fir-tree; *pekahan*, the bark of the fir used in covering the wigwam; *angem*, the snow shoe.

4. The tobacco weed and the fruits and berries that were most useful for food.

5. Almost all the articles of food and clothing and religious articles imported by traders and colonists.

6. A few of the members of the human body, as *mañmanak*, the eyebrows.

7. Probably it was for superstitious reasons that *saagigem*, a wart, *tseg8ar*, a cancer, *pem8e*, a boil, and the names of some diseases were put into the noble class.

A full list of these exceptional words could be easily made from the dictionary. It is sufficient for my purpose to indicate here their classes.

A knowledge of the class to which an object belongs is necessary in order to speak of it correctly in Abnaki. For it is by the class, whether noble or ignoble, to which it belongs that not only its inflection in number, conjugation, and accidents is determined, but its agreement with pronouns and government by verbs. In a word, this distinction of noble and ignoble objects is the ruling principle in the whole system of Abnaki inflections, and this is the characteristic of the entire linguistic family to which it belongs.

II. *Inflection.*

The Abnaki nouns are inflected by number, conjugation, and accidents. Whatever explanation this nomenclature requires will be given under each of the inflections.

I. *Number.*

The Abnaki noun has two numbers, the singular and plural. In most languages number in verbs corresponds to number in nouns, but Abnaki verbs have two forms of the plural, which I call the *plural* simple and the *perplural.* It will be sufficient to state here that the first describes the act or state of only a few, three or four at most, whilst the second, the perplural, implies the act or state of a greater number.

The following are the rules for the formation of the plural: —

I. Nouns of the noble class form the plural generally by the addition of *-ak* to the singular, and nouns of the ignoble class by the addition of *-ar.*

Examples: —

1. *Noble Objects.*

Singular.	Plural.
Arem8s, a dog.	*Arem8sak*, dogs.
Néman, a son.	*Nemanak*, sons.
A8ansis, a child.	*A8ansisak*, children.
Títĕgeri, a screech owl.	*Titegeriak*, screech owls.
Tĕg8, a wave.	*Teg8ak*, waves.

2. *Ignoble Objects.*

8ig8am, a cabin.	*8ig8amar*, cabins.
Temahigan, an axe.	*Temahiganar*, axes.
Ta8ap8di, a seat.	*Ta8ap8diar*, seats.
Peg8assabem, a pond.	*Peg8assabemar*, ponds.

II. Nouns that end in *e* drop this vowel before, or rather change it into, *a* of the plural increase.

Examples: —

1. *Noble Objects.*

Arenañbe, an Abnaki.	*Arenañbak*, Abnakis.
Seenañbe, a man.	*Seenañbak*, men.
P8débe, a whale.	*P8debak*, whales.

2. *Ignoble Objects.*

Hage, the body.	*Hagar*, bodies.
8asa8e, pumpkin.	*8asa8ar*, pumpkins.

III. Monosyllables, with a diphthong or long vowel, and ending with a consonant, and dissyllables and even trisyllables which have the penult long or accented, make the plural in *8k* and *8r*, according to their class, instead of in *ak* and *ar*.

Examples : —

1. *Noble Class.*

M8s, a moose.	*M8s8k*, moose.
Ka8s, a cow.	*Ka8s8k*, cows.
Pēnem, a woman.	*Pēnem8k*, women.

2. *Ignoble Class.*

Sîg8at, a bone.	*Si8ad8r*, bones.
Ag8îden, a canoe.	*Ag8iden8r*, canoes.
Madêgen, a skin.	*Madegen8r*, skins.

IV. Nouns of the ignoble class that end in *k8* or *g8* form the plural merely by the addition of *r*.

Examples : —

Bak8, an herb.	*Bag8r*, herbs.
Penapsk8, a stone.	*Penapsk8r*, stones.
Mta8ak8, the ear.	*Mta8ag8r*, ears.
Skar8nesk8, shot.	*Skar8nesk8r*, grains of shot.

OBSERVATIONS : 1. A few words of the noble

class, with this ending, make the plural in 8*k* instead of 8*ak*, or in both, as *p8p8khan8ik8*, *sêᶜtag8*.

In modern Penobscot and St. Francis dialects none of the words which form the plural in 8*k* and 8*r* (*ol*) have the 8 fully sounded in the singular.

2. It will be observed that, in the examples given under the rules III. and IV., *k* and *t* of the singular are changed respectively into *g* and *d* before the plural increase, except where *k* is preceded by *s*, as in *penapsk8*. This euphonic change takes place in all inflections, both of nouns and verbs.

V. There are several nouns which are used only in the singular, as 8*assañri*, snow, *mek8ampak*, wine; others only in the plural, as *pedangiak*, thunder; others, again, that have a collective or general meaning in the singular, have a distributive sense in the plural, as *abañn*, bread, *abañnak*, loaves of bread; *pek8ami*, ice, *pek8amiak*, icicles.

Participial nouns, which are nothing else than the participles of verbs, form their plurals according to the verbal conjugation to which they belong, and come under the head of verbs.

II. *Conjugation.*

I take the terms "conjugation" and "accidents," as here used, from the "Études philologiques sur quelques langues sauvages de l'Amérique," by the learned Sulpitian, M. Cuoq (Montreal, 1866), to whose writings on the Algonquin I am much indebted for the light which they shed on our ma-

terials for the study of the Abnaki. Under the heads of conjugation and accidents comes the question of case, or what corresponds in these languages to case in the languages of Europe.

What M. Cuoq says of the Algonkin, namely, that its nouns "are conjugated, not declined," is equally true of the Abnaki. By this it is not meant that they have the functions of verbs, or have mood and tense in the same sense that verbs have them, but that their inflection in connection with pronominal marks is like the inflections of the verbs which correspond to them in class and govern them.

Besides, it will be seen that nouns have temporal accidents, so that a verbal signification seems to be implied in them.[1] This view of the nature of the Abnaki noun seems to receive confirmation from F. Râle's dictionary, where the plural nominative case of address is in one place (ad voc. *compagnons*) described by the appellation of the "Imperative." For the understanding of this part of our subject, it will be necessary to anticipate the exposition of the pronouns, and explain here the *personals*, or the marks of the personal and possessive pronouns.

THE PERSONALS.

1. There are three personals: *ne*, *ke*, and 8 (or *a*). Their use is to indicate the pronouns, both per-

[1] For a fuller explanation of the verbal nature of the Indian noun, I refer to a paper on the Algonkin verb, by Hon. J. Hammond Trumbull.

sonal and possessive. *Ne* stands for the first person, *ke* for the second, 8 for the third. They are the same for both numbers.

They resemble in several respects, even in sound, the suffix pronouns in Hebrew, but differ from these in being prefixed. Like these they appear to be contractions of separate forms. *Ne* or *n'* is contracted from *nia*, I, and *ni8na*, we; *ke*, or *k'*, from *kia*, thou, and *ki8na*, and *kir8a*, we and you; 8 from 8*a* or 88*a*, this (one). This last personal presents a little difficulty, inasmuch as the separate personal pronoun of the third person is *égema*, he, and its plural *égema8a*, they.

2. It is by means of the personals that nouns, and, in some of their moods, verbs, are conjugated. Placed before nouns the personals are equivalent to our possessive pronouns, *my*, *thy*, *his*, *her*, *its*, *our*, *your*, *their*, as the nature of the word may require. Before verbs they are equivalent to our personal pronouns, *I*, *thou*, *he*, *she*, or *it*; *we*, *you*, *they*, as the sense may require; for, as I have already mentioned, in Abnaki the same pronoun stands for *he* and *she* and *it*, when *it* stands for a noble object.

3. But, whereas in English, and in most of the other languages, there is only one sign for the first person plural, both in personal and possessive pronouns (*we*, *our*), Algic dialects have two first persons plural, which, after Cuoq and Bishop Baraga, I distinguish by the names *exclusive* plural and *inclusive* plural.

This phenomenon escaped, for a long time, the comprehension of students of Indian languages. Eliot and Zeisberger do not even mention it in their respective grammars, yet there is no doubt as to its presence both in the Massachusetts and the Delaware. Duponceau had observed the phenomenon, and called these plurals the "particular" and "general" plural, respectively, yet even he failed to understand their difference. In the dictionary, examples of these plurals occur in a few places, with their translations carefully distinguished (ad voc. *corps*, *rôti*). The following is the rule for their use : —

When the speaker includes in the plural the third person, but excludes the second, he employs the pronoun *ni8na*, and its personal *ne* or *n'*; but when he includes the second person with or without the third, he uses *ki8na* and its personal *ke* or *k'*. In the first case the plural is composed of the speaker and some other person or persons, to the exclusion of the person spoken to, and means *we*, not including *thou* or *you*; in the second, the plural is composed of the speaker and person or persons spoken to, whether the predicate is common to others or not, and means *thou* or *you*, and *I* or *we*. Perhaps the best illustration of this usage is by algebraic terms, thus : —

Exclusive plural = first person plural — second person singular or plural; but inclusive plural = first person (singular or plural) + second person singular or plural.

The exclusive plural, notwithstanding its name, may include all people except the person or persons addressed, whilst the inclusive plural may embrace only the speaker and the person spoken to.

Very appropriate examples of the exclusive plural are given in the Lord's Prayer and Hail Mary, where the "our" of the Our Father and the petitions that follow excludes God, who is addressed, and Holy Mary is excluded from "us sinners." The inclusive plural offers no difficulty.[1]

4. The personals undergo euphonic changes occasioned by the initial letter of the following word; when the following word begins with a vowel (except 8), *d* (or *t*) is inserted between the personal and vowel, as, *a8ikhigan*, a book, *ned a8ikhigan*, my book; *a8ansis*, a child, *ked a8ansis*, thy child; *ag8iden*, a canoe, *8d ag8iden*, his canoe.

5. Before words beginning with 8 no euphonic letter is inserted, and the vowel of the personal coalesces with this 8, as, *n'8tahangan*, *k'8tahangan*, *8tahangan*, my, thy, his, paddle, from *8tahangan*, a paddle.

Observations: 1. Instead of 8 for the personal of the third person, Father Râle in several places uses *a*, particularly before words beginning with *p* or 8, as, *a 8ig8am*, his cabin.

[1] The difference between the inclusive and exclusive plurals is pretty well explained in the *Kimzo8i A8ikhigan* (Learning Book), from which extracts are published in vol. vi. of publications of the Maine Historical Society.

2. In several words, chiefly words beginning with *k* and *sk* in their separate form, he inserts *da* between the personals (the third included) and the noun, as, *kikkañn*, a field; *neda kikkañn*, my field; *skañpet8*, a trail; *keda skañpet8*, thy trail. It is possible that such words had this vowel originally, and lost it in the unconjugated form, whilst retaining it after the personals. This at least would appear to be the case with *ki*, the earth, which was *aki* in the Massachusetts and Algonkin languages.

The same rules govern the union of personals with verbs as their union with nouns.

F. Râle and the writers on Abnaki since his time have united the personal with its noun or verb, as if it formed one word with it. I presume the reason is that, like the Hebrew suffix pronouns, these personals are never used except in conjunction with a noun or verb. Baraga and Cuoq, and others among more recent writers, have written them separately in the kindred languages, and, because this method is one more conducive to clearness, if for no other reason, I shall conform to it.

From these explanations I proceed to give examples of the conjugation of each of the two classes into which nouns are divided. Two examples of each class will be sufficient, one of a word beginning, and one of a word ending, with a vowel.

Examples of conjugation: —

I. *Noble Objects.*

Arem8s, a dog.

	Singular.	Plural.
	Ned arem8s, my dog.	*Ned arem8sak*, my dogs.
	Ked arem8s, thy dog.	*Ked arem8sak*, thy dogs.
	8d arem8sar, his or her dog.	*8d arem8sa*, his or her dogs.
Excl. 1.	*Ned arem8sena*, our dog.	*Ned arem8sena8ak*, our dogs.
Incl.	*Ked arem8sena*, our dog.	*Ked arem8sena8ak*, our dogs.
2.	*Ked arem8se8añ*, your dog.	*Ked arem8se8añk*, your dogs.
3.	*8d arem8se8ar*, their dog.	*8d arem8se8a*, their dogs.

Our next example will illustrate how thoroughly an English word may be disguised in an Indian grammatical dress.

Ahass8, a horse.

	Singular.	Plural.
1.	*Ned ahass8*, my horse.	*Ned ahass8ak*, my horses.
2.	*Ked ahass8*, thy horse.	*Ked ahass8ak*, thy horses.
3.	*8d ahass8ar*, his horse.	*8d ahass8a*, his or her horses.
1.	*Ned ahass8na*, our horse. *Ked ahass8na*, our horse.	*Ned ahass8na8ak*, our horses. *Ked ahass8na8ak*, our horses.
2.	*Ked ahass88añ*, your horse.	*Ked ahass88añk*, your horses.
3.	*8d ahass88ar*, their horse.	*8d ahass88a*, their horses.

II. *Ignoble Objects.*

1. *A8ikhigan*, a book.

1.	*Ned a8ikhigan*, my book.	*Ned a8ikhiganar*, my books.
2.	*Ked a8ikhigan*, thy book.	*Ked a8ikhiganar*, thy books.
3.	*8d a8ikhigan*, his or her book.	*8d a8ikhiganar*, his books.

1.	*Ned a8ikhiganna*, our book.	*Ned a8ikhiganna8ar*, our books.
	Ked a8ikhiganna, our book.	*Ked a8ikhiganna8ar*, our books.
2.	*Ked a8ikhigan8a*, your book.	*Ked a8ikhigan8ar*, your books.
3.	*8d a8ikhigan8a*, their book.	*8d a8ikhigan8ar*, their books.

2. *Ta8ip8di*, a table.

1.	*Ne ta8ip8di*, my table.	*Ne ta8ip8diar*, my tables.
2.	*Ke ta8ip8di*, thy table.	*Ke ta8ip8diar*, thy tables.
3.	*8 ta8ip8di*, his or her table.	*8 ta8ip8diar*, his or her tables.
1.	*Ne ta8ip8dina*, our table.	*Ne ta8ip8dina8ar*, our tables.
	Ke ta8ip8dina, our table.	*Ke ta8ip8dina8ar*, our tables.
2.	*Ke ta8ip8di8a*, your table.	*Ke ta8ip8di8ar*, your tables.
3.	*8 ta8ip8di8a*, their table.	*8 ta8ip8di8ar*, their tables.

IRREGULAR NOUNS.

There are several words beginning with *m*, which drop this letter on receiving the personals.

These words are mostly names of members of the human body, and of articles of domestic use. A list of these could be readily drawn up for a full grammar of the language; for the present it will be sufficient to subjoin some examples: —

Metep, the head, becomes (1) *n'etep*, (2) *k'etep*, (3) *8tep*, etc.
Meretsi, the hand, becomes *n'eretsi*, *k'eretsi*, etc.
Mañ8e, the cheek, becomes *n'añ8e*, *k'añ8e*, *8añ8e*, etc.
Mibit, a tooth, becomes *n'ibit*, *k'ibit*, *8ibit*, etc.
Mirar8, the tongue, becomes *n'irar8*, *k'irar8*, *8irar8*, etc.
Masse, bed-clothes, becomes *n'asse*, and *ned asse*, etc.
Medor, a craft (boat), becomes *n'edor*, etc.

Many of these words are seldom or never used without the personal, and hence the modern In-

dians have in some cases lost the ancient form in which they were employed separately.

To illustrate the propriety of calling this inflection of nouns by the name of "conjugation," I will here present an example of the inflection of verbs in the indicative mood, present tense.

I. *Noble Objects.*

Singular.

1. *Ne namiha ned angem*, I see my snowshoe.
2. *Ke namiha ked angem*, thou seest thy snowshoe.
3. 8 *namihañr* 8*d angemar*, he sees his snowshoe.

1. { *Ne namihanna ned angemena*, we see our snowshoe.
   { *Ke namihanna ked angemena*, we see our snowshoe.
2. *Ke namiha*8*añ ked angeme*8*añ*, you see your snowshoe.
3. 8 *namiha*8*ar* 8*d angeme*8*ar*, they see their snowshoe.

Plural.

1. *Ne namihañk ned angemak*, I see my snowshoes.
2. *Ke namihañk ked angemak*, thou seest thy snowshoes.
3. 8 *namiha* 8*d angema*, he sees his snowshoes.

1. { *Ne namihana*8*ak ned angemena*8*ak*, we see our snowshoes.
   { *Ke namihana*8*ak ked angemena*8*ak*, we see our snowshoes.
2. *Ke namiha*8*añk ked angeme*8*añk*, you see your snowshoes.
3. 8 *namiha*8*a* 8*d angeme*8*a*, they see their snowshoes.

II. *Ignoble Objects.*

Singular.

1. *Ne namit*8*n ne temahigan*, I see my axe.
2. *Ke namit*8*n ke temahigan*, thou seest thy axe.
3. 8 *namit*8*n* 8 *temahigan*, he sees his axe.

1. { *Ne namit*8*nena ne temahiganna*, we see our axe.
   { *Ke namit*8*nena ke temahiganna*, we see our axe.

2. *Ke namitɛna ke temahiganɛa*, you see your axe.
3. ɛ *namitɛna* ɛ *temahiganɛa*, they see their axe.

Plural.

1. *Ne namitɛnar ne temahiganar*, I see my axes.
2. *Ke namitɛnar ke temahiganar*, thou seest thy axes.
3. ɛ *namitɛnar* ɛ *temahiganar*, he sees his axes.

1. { *Ne namitɛnenaɛar ne temahigannaɛar*, we see our axes.
   { *Ke namitɛnenaɛar ke temahigannaɛar*, we see our axes.
2. *Ke namitɛnar ke temahiganɛar*, you see your axes.
3. ɛ *namitɛnar* ɛ *temahiganɛar*, they see their axes.

III. *Accidents.*

We come now to the accidents, the third kind of inflections which Abnaki nouns undergo. The accidents of nouns are, all but one, certain affixes and changes at the end of words which modify their signification. They stand sometimes for an adjective, sometimes for a preposition, and occasionally for a whole phrase, in English, and, to some extent, for declension in Latin. For each change they make in the noun, there is a corresponding change in the verb.

The nominal accidents are: 1. the possessive; 2. the diminutive; 3. the vocative plural; 4. the past; 5. the obviative; 6. the locative. I have followed, in denominating them, M. Cuoq, already mentioned. They will require to be explained in separate sections.

1. The Possessive.

Besides the personals, the Abnaki has a sign of more special connection with an object, the nearest

approach to which is the adjective *own* in English, as in, *in one's own house*. This mark consists in the addition of *m*, *em*, or 8*m*, to the singular of nouns and in treating thereafter the word thus formed as a primitive word.

Examples : —

Ned arem8s, my dog. *Ned arem8sem*, my (own) dog.
Ne senañbe, my man. *Ne senañbem*, my (own) man, husband.

The euphonic rules for affixing this accident to nouns are : —

1. To affix only *m* to words ending in a vowel ; *em* to words ending in a consonant, and 8*m* to words that make the plural in 8*k* or 8*r*. Examples of this last case are : *ne pe'nem8m* (literally) my woman, but employed only to designate a *man's* sister ; 8 *sig8ad8m*, his bone ; 8*d ag8iden8m*, his canoe.

2. This accident is affixed to conjugated nouns only, nouns combined with personals. Its effect is often to distinguish names of members of the human body from the members of the same name in animals, as 8 *bakkan8m*, his blood, *i. e.*, the blood of his own body, etc.

3. When once words have received this accident, they retain it in all their inflections, and are treated as primitive words ending in a consonant.

Examples : —

	Singular.	Plural.
1.	*Ne senañbem*, my husband.	*Ne senañbemak*, my husbands.
2.	*Ke senañbem*, thy husband.	*Ke senañbemak*, thy husbands.
3.	8 *senañbemar*, her husband.	8 *senañbema*, her husbands.

2. The Diminutive.

The diminutive is the affix *is* or *sis*, placed at the end of words in the singular, and conveying the idea of small or little in English, or of the termination *kin* in mannikin. It is sometimes used as a patronymic, as a term of endearment, and not infrequently to express contempt.

The rules for affixing this accident are analogous to those which I gave for the possessive. *Is* is employed for the diminutive of words ending in a consonant or in 8 (which, in that case, is pronounced like our *w*), and *sis* for the diminutive of nouns ending in a vowel.

Examples: —

Arem8s, a dog.	*Arem8sis*, a little dog.
Temahigan, an axe.	*Temahiganis*, a little axe.
Penapsk8, a stone.	*Penapsk8is*, a pebble.

But nouns that make the plural in *8k* or *8r*, and do not end in 8 in the singular, make the diminutive in *8sis*, as, *peʿnem*, a woman; *peʿnem8sis*, a little woman; *ag8iden*, a canoe; *ag8iden8sis*, a little canoe.

In a few cases the diminutive is in *imis*, which form seems to include the possessive mark, as *kiabimis*, an orphan, from *kiabes*.

The diminutive may be double to convey the idea of still smaller dimensions, as, *ag8iden8sisis*, a very small canoe (a trinket).

As an example of the signification of endearment expressed by the diminutive, take the follow-

ing from Father Râle: "*Perabain* 8e8essin8is *ke Jess8issemena*, Potestne dici quan exquisitus homo sit *Jesulus* noster."

Once formed, diminutives are treated in all respects as primitive nouns.

3. The Vocative Plural.

With the exception of a few words to be mentioned below, the vocative singular of Abnaki nouns is not different from the nominative.[1] But to express the vocative plural the syllable *t8k*, *d8k*, or *8t8k*, is added to the singular. As already intimated, Father Râle calls this accident the "imperative" (ad voc. *compagnon*), and in fact it is the same in form as the second person plural of the imperative of a certain set of verbs.

Examples: —

Ts8es, a companion.	*Ts8esd8k*, O companions.
A8ansis, a child.	*A8ansist8k*, O children.
Senañbe, a man.	*Senañbet8k*, O men.

T8k, or *d8k*, is the accident of the vocative plural in all nouns except those which make the plural in *8k* (or *8r*). The latter take *8t8k*, as *pe'nem8t8k*, O women.

The exceptions with a vocative singular are the colloquial and family names: —

[1] Duponceau (Notes to Eliot's grammar) fancied he had discovered in the Lennilenape a vocative singular, but his examples are all participles of verbs, which shows how far the celebrated Indian scholar was from understanding his specialty. Participles can and must be often employed to express our nominatives of address, but they do not for that become nouns.

Mitañg8i, my father, from *mitank8s*, a father.
N'iga, my mother; *niga8s*, my mother.
M8s8mi, and *m8sm8m*, my grandfather; *n'8kemi*, grandmother, from *mosemis* and *okemis*.
N'a, my husband or my wife, equal to *n'a*, he or she.

4. The Past.

The accident of the past in nouns is a certain syllable appended to a noun to signify that the person whose name (or office) it modifies is absent, dead or missing, or the thing whose name is similarly affected is damaged, lost, or destroyed. To render this point clearer I will give examples at once. Thus, *patriañs*, a priest, missionary, with this accident becomes *patriañsa*, or *patriañsga*, a former priest (now gone or dead); *a8ikhigan*, a book, *a8ikhigané*, the book that was but is lost or destroyed.

There are four forms of the past found in the dictionary: *a* added to nouns of the noble class, and *e* to nouns of the ignoble class, as in the examples given; *ga* added to nouns of both classes, and *ban* or *pan*, which are the endings of the past tense in verbs. Father Râle gives examples of the first three in nouns proper, but of the fourth only in participial nouns. On the first two he gives grammatical notes in the "Particulæ," the purport of which I have just endeavored to convey. Here now are further examples: —

Niben, summer; *nibené*, the summer past.
N'esit, my foot; *temesans8e n'esité*, my foot is cut off.
8ig8am, a cabin; *8ig8amé*, a fallen cabin.

8ibit, his tooth; *peg8atsire 8ibité*, his tooth has fallen out.

Narañts8ani, plural *-ak*, a dweller or native of Norridgewalk; *Narañts8anigak*, the Norridgewalks of long ago.

Ke mitañk8se8aga, plural *-gak*, your deceased father, fathers.

Ke patriañsmena, our missionary; *ke patriañsmen8gak*, our deceased missionaries.

Ked akina8e, our lost land, the name by which the modern Penobscots call the territory of their ancestors.

Mari Sosepisk8e, Mary, the wife of Joseph; *Mari Sosepisk8epan*, who *was* the wife of Joseph.

The following are the rules for affixing the three forms of this accident: —

1. *A* and *e* are used only in the singular.
2. *ga* and *pan* are used both in the singular and plural.
3. Frequently *a* is added even to *pan*, in speaking of deceased persons.

Observations: 1. Although I find no instance of it in Râle, analogy would lead to the inference that there was another sign of the past in nouns, namely, the interrogative or dubitative past. Such a form is found in verbs, and is called the "preterite" by Râle. It consists in the endings *assa*, *essa*, *issa*, or *8ssa*. It survives in the modern Penobscot and St. Francis dialects. An example of this form would be the phrase, *Ke sañgemañ8aassa?* Was he your chief? — from *sañgema*, a chief.

2. Under the word *mort* occurs another form of the past, which consists in the addition of *mañda*, the negative adverb, and the prefix of *e* or *8e*, to the noun. This mode of expression is obsolete in the Penobscot, if it ever existed in it, and I have not discovered its parallel in any of the kindred languages.

The *mañda*, or negative, is sufficiently intelligible, but the prefix I can only conjecture from the analogy of the verbs. The instances in which this form of expression occurs are evidently formulæ which Father Râle had composed for recommending to the prayers of his flock the souls of deceased members. For example: *Kepañbatama-8e8anna N. 8edaren8m, tai 8nitsanna*, We (let us) pray for N., a deceased brother, and his children. Here the prefix *8e* in *8edaren8m* is the sign of the past.

A similar prefix is found in the participles of verbs, and most generally is a relative mark, that is, implying *who* or *which*. From this I infer that as nouns have the accident of tense as in the examples given above, they also had a participial relative form, of which the phrases referred to are instances.

5. The Obviative.

The obviative is an accident which affects nouns of the noble class only, and these only in certain situations in the phrase or sentence. For nouns in the singular, it consists in putting *r* instead of the *k* of their plural in conjugation; and for nouns in the plural, in dropping the final *r* from the obviative of the singular. Examples will be given with the situations referred to, which are: —

1. When nouns are connected with the third personal 8, as in the conjugation of *arem8s*, *8d arem8sar*, his dog; *8d arem8sa*, his dogs.

2. When the noun is the object of the action of

another noun of the noble class, as, to use Râle's examples, —

1. *Ak8irda8añr sa8angan namesar*, the eagle swoops down upon a fish. *Namesar* is the obviative singular from *names*. 2. *Ed8dermiaked Jes8s, 8d erērmañ eᶜto angeria?* does Jesus love the angels so much as he loves us? Here *angeria*, from *angeri* in the singular, is in the obviative plural.

3. When the verb has two objects of the noble class, one direct and the other indirect, both are in the obviative after a verb in the third person, and at least one is in the obviative after a verb in the first or second person. Examples: 1. *Assañ 8miranar 8nemanar abanar*, John gives his son bread; where the words for son and bread are in the obviative, bread being a noble object. 2 (from Râle). *Arenañbar ned assamannar a8ehande8ak*, I expose a man to wild beasts; where the word for man is in the obviative. It may occur to some to think that the well-known accusative is all that is meant by the obviative, and that the Latin endings in *am, em, um* correspond to the Abnaki *ar* and *8r*. It will be sufficient to answer that the obviative is a mark, or accident, which distinguishes nouns only in connection with third persons, whereas the Latin accusative may follow any of the three persons. Thus whilst I can say, *Ne moᶜsañtsin Ketsi Ni8esk8*, I love the Great Spirit (Amo Deum), I must say *Pier 8 moᶜsañtsinar K. Ni8esk8ar*, Peter loves the Great Spirit (Petrus amat Deum).

Observation: The kindred languages, the Chip-

peway (or Otchebwe), the Algonkin, and the Cree have an additional affix to distinguish the third person in the phrase. M. Cuoq calls it the "sur-obviative," Lacombe the "relative," and Baraga the *third* 3d person. I can find no trace of a corresponding accident in the Abnaki. Its absence would doubtless lead to some confusion if usage did not give a meaning to words from their position in the sentence.

6. The Locative.

The locative is an accident which answers in signification to most of the prepositions in European languages, its signification varying with the verb in the phrase. Its name suggests local "He" in Hebrew, but its equivalent is found only in the Hebrew preposition syllables. This accident appears in one of its forms in several of our geographical names, and in all those ending in *keag* and *cook*, like Kenduskeag, etc.

There are two forms of it in the singular of nouns and one in the plural; but they occasion euphonic changes according to the endings of the words to which they are appended.

I. *-k* and *-ge* added to the nominative are the locative affixes, in the singular, of words ending in a vowel; and *-ek* and *-ege* of words ending in a consonant. In the plural it is *ik8k* or *8ik8k*. The full meaning of this accident can be best conveyed by examples:—

Ki, the earth, ground; loc. *kik*, in or on the earth.
Spemki, heaven; *spemkik*, or *spemkige*, in heaven.
Kandeski, Bangor; *kandeskik*, or *kandeskige*, in or at Bangor.
Kis8s, the sun; *kis8sek 8tsipate*, it dries in the sun.
Abassi, a tree; *anga8ate abassik*, it is shady under a tree.
Abassi, a post; *ned assidebiran abassik*, I tie him to a post.
Pek8ami, ice; *ned 'rikdai pek8amik*, I leap on ice.
Pañbatami-8ig8amik8, a house of prayer, temple; *8skitran Jes8sar matsk8 pañbatami8ig8amig8k pita spemek*, Satan placed Jesus on the top of the temple.
8 tep, his head; *nedertehañ 8 tepek*, I strike him on the head.

2. Examples of the plural: —

8dene, a village; *ne ki8dai 8denaik8k*, I go around from village to village (among the villages).
8ig8am, a cabin; *arenañbak ai8ak 8ig8amik8k*, the men are in cabins.
Senañbe, a man; *senañbeik8k*, among men.
Pe'nem, a woman; *pe'nem8ik8k*, among women.

On account of the similarity with the affixes here given, I put under this accident *ge* and *ke* frequently appended to nouns of the noble class without a local signification. Of these Râle says that *ge* is equivalent to the Latin *apud*, and *ke* to the Latin *ex*.

Examples: —

1. *Pres*, a pigeon; *presege ergir8k*, as large as a pigeon; *psipenege arig8*, is like garlic, from *psipen*, garlic; *a8akange ned 'rihoge*, I am treated as a slave, from *a8akan*, a slave.
2. *Ketsi nit8esk8inn8ke k. nit8esk8inn8*, God from God; *Bagadasem8inn8ke bagadasem8inno*, Light from light; *N'hagakke ketetebermer*, Je t'estime autant que ma personne.

Among the locative marks there remains to be

mentioned the affix *-inek*, which I find only in the translation of the angelical salutation, "Hail Mary," *k'8tsinek8itañbamek8ssi pe'nem8inek*, Blessed art thou amongst women. It is the same in signification as the termination *-ik8k*, in the examples given above.

To illustrate more fully the locative affix, I subjoin a conjugated noun in the locative.

8ig8am, a cabin, home.

Singular.

1. *N'ig8amek*, in my cabin.
2. *K'ig8amek*, in thy house.
3. *A8ig8amek*, in his house.

1. *N'ig8amn8k* (*-ak*), in our house; *k'ig8amn8k* (*-ak*), in our house.
2. *K'ig8am8añk*, in your house.
3. *A8ig8am8añk*, in their house.

Plural.

1. *N'ig8amik8k*, in my houses.
2. *K'ig8amik8k*, in thy houses.
3. *A8ig8amik8k*, in his houses.

1. *N'ig8amik88añk*, in our houses; *k'ig8amik88añk*, in our houses.
2. *K'ig8amik88añk*, in your houses.
3. *A8ig8amik88añk*, in their houses.

Observation: It is worthy of remark that the marks of the locative ending in *k* and *ge* have a striking resemblance to the present participle and present suppositive respectively, of neuter and impersonal verbs, and that *ik8k* differs but very little from the present participle of a whole set of verbs,

which may be called verbs of plenty. I make this observation because it tends to confirm the view I have already intimated of there being a verbal meaning latent in the Abnaki noun.

With the locative ends the list of inflections to which the noun is subject.

CASE.

From the foregoing it will be inferred that the only inflections in Abnaki that correspond to case in English are the inflections of "conjugation" by which the possessive case may be expressed, but is not necessarily, and the "locative," corresponding to the objective case, chiefly as following certain prepositions. The inflection of the "obviative" is not so much to distinguish the object and subject in the phrase, although it serves to do that in some sentences, as to distinguish nouns of the noble class and third person coming together in a certain relation.

In conjugation, so far as it corresponds to the possessive, it will be observed that it is not the name of the possessor but of the object of possession that is inflected, as is the case in Shemitic languages.

Apart from these changes there is no inflection for case, and consequently the noun is the same in the nominative and objective. The verbal system is such as to dispense almost altogether with prepositions, or combine them with verbs in such a way as to express complex relations without change in the subject or object.

POSTSCRIPT.

The paper here given attempts to describe the grammar of the Abnaki, chiefly so far as it may be gathered in the writings of Father Râle, but the same principles apply to the modern Penobscot, the St. Francis, and St. John dialects, and to a great extent also to the Passamaquoddy. The chief change necessary to make the language of Father Râle's time intelligible to an intelligent member of any of the tribal branches above mentioned is to substitute the letter *l* for *r* in all words where *r* occurs.

Besides this change I may mention that the tendency of the modern dialects is to use the vowel O, which is rarely found in Father Râle's dictionary, for the 8 as a vowel, which is so frequently used, either as a vowel or a consonant.

Ayer
oPM
551
.027
1887

AYER
Abnaki
-Tuc